

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 19, and 21-24 are pending. Claims 1, 2, and 22 are amended; Claim 20 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 23 and 24 are newly submitted. No new matter is introduced.<sup>1</sup>

The outstanding Office Action objected to the drawings. In addition, Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite; Claims 1, 19, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Cho (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,477); Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cho in view of Toshiyuki (European Patent Application Publication No. 0 545 429); and Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cho.

In objecting to the drawings, the outstanding Office Action asserts that the drawings do not depict a combination of backlight units of different shapes as previously recited in Claim 2. Amended Claim 2 no longer recites a combination of backlight units of different shapes. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is believed to be rendered moot. All of the drawings are believed to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), and it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In rejecting Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the Office Action asserts that “[i]t is not clear how each of the single backlight units has a single light source

---

<sup>1</sup> Amended Claims 2, 19 and 22 find support in the claims as previously filed and at least at page 10, line 3 to page to page 15, line 26, for Claim 19; and page 27, line 9 to page 28, line 16 for Claim 2, for example. Amended Claim 1 finds support at least at page 18, lines 19-31 of the specification as originally filed, for example. New Claim 23 finds support at least at page 20, line 26 to page 21, line 13 of the specification as originally filed, for example. New Claim 24 finds support at least at page 11, line 23 to page 12, line 3 of the specification as originally filed, for example.

and then further includes two additional light sources.”<sup>2</sup> Amended Claim 2 no longer recites a plurality of backlight units, but instead recites a first backlight unit and a second backlight unit. Amended Claim 2 further recites that the first backlight unit includes a first single light source, and that the second backlight unit includes a second single light source. Thus amended Claim 2 clarifies the relationship between the claimed light sources, the first backlight unit, and the second backlight unit. Accordingly, all of the claims are believed to be definite and clear, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Amended Claim 1 recites a backlight configured to illuminate a back of a video display unit formed by a single panel. Claim 1 recites that the backlight includes a plurality of backlight units arranged to be incident to a lighting surface. Amended Claim 1 further recites that one of the plurality of backlight units is controlled by a drive unit including *a light quantity detector*.

Turning to the applied reference, Figure 1 of Cho illustrates a back light assembly 600 that includes a light supply unit group 200, a mold frame 300 as a receiving container, optical sheets 400 and a display unit fixing cover 500.<sup>3</sup> The light supply unit group 200 includes a plurality of light supply units 150, each having a light guiding plate 110 and a lamp unit 130.<sup>4</sup> However, Cho fails to disclose or suggest that any of the light supply units are controlled by a device including *a light quantity detector*.

Accordingly, Cho fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of amended independent Claim 1. It is submitted that Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are in

---

<sup>2</sup> See the outstanding Office Action at page 4, lines 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> See Cho, at column 3, lines 34-37.

<sup>4</sup> See Cho, at column 3, lines 38-40.

condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1 based on Cho be withdrawn.

Amended dependent Claim 19 recites further features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Amended Claim 19 incorporates the subject matter previously recited in Claim 20 and further recites that the plurality of backlight units are arranged to be incident to a lighting surface and arranged in alternating directions in at least two rows *that each extend in a first direction* such that a backlight unit in one of the at least two rows differs in orientation with respect to an adjacent backlight unit in the one of the at least two rows by 180 degrees. Amended Claim 19 further clarifies that the light source included in each of the backlight units *extends substantially parallel to the first direction*.

Turning to the applied reference, Figure 7 of Cho illustrates a light supply units group 200 that includes two light supply unit groups 160 and 170.<sup>5</sup> Each of the light supply unit groups has two light supply units coupled to each other.<sup>6</sup> The two light supply unit groups 160 and 170 are coupled to each other such that thinner portion of unit light supply unit of one light supply unit group faces a thinner portion of unit light supply unit of the other light supply unit group.<sup>7</sup> However, the light supply unit groups 160 and 170 are not arranged in alternating directions *in at least two rows that each extend in a first direction* in which the light source in each light supply unit *extends substantially parallel to the first direction*.

The Office Action acknowledged that “Cho does not explicitly teach the backlight units being arranged in alternating directions in at least two rows,” but asserts that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

---

<sup>5</sup> See Cho, at col. 6, lines 27-28.

<sup>6</sup> See Cho, at col. 6, lines 28-30.

<sup>7</sup> See Cho, at col. 6, lines 30-34.

have the backlight units being arranged in alternating directions in at least two rows depending on the size of the display needing illumination, since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.”<sup>8</sup> However, amended Claim 1 clarifies that the rows extend in a *first direction* and that each of the backlight units include a light source that *extends substantially parallel to the first direction*.

Figures 1 and 3 of Cho illustrate that the light supply unit group 200 includes a plurality of light supply units 150, each having a light guiding plate 110 and a lamp unit 130.<sup>9</sup> As can be seen in Figure 7, the lamp units 130 extend in a direction (into the page) that is *perpendicular to* a direction (across the page) in which the light supply unit groups 160 and 170 are arrayed. The outstanding Office Action identifies the lamp unit 130 as the claimed light source and states that Figure 7 of Cho illustrates “at least one row of alternating backlight units such that the two adjacent backlight units in the middle are different in orientation.” However, the row identified in Figure 7 of Cho by the Office Action extends substantially *perpendicular to* the extension direction of the lamp units 130. Thus, Cho fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of backlight units arranged in alternating directions in at least two rows *that each extend in a first direction* and that each of the backlight units include a light source that *extends substantially parallel to the first direction*.

Accordingly, Cho fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of dependent Claim 19. It is submitted that dependent Claim 19 and the claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

---

<sup>8</sup> See the outstanding Office Action at page 8, lines 15-21.

<sup>9</sup> See Cho, at col. 3, lines 38-41.

Amended Claim 2 relates to a backlight configured to illuminate a back of a video display unit formed by a single panel. Amended Claim 2 recites a first backlight unit that includes a first single light source, and a first single light reflecting unit configured to reflect a first light emitted from the first single light source onto a first single light guide plate. Amended Claim 2 further recites a second backlight unit that includes a second single light source *that is longer than the first single light source*, and at least two second light reflecting units configured to reflect a second light emitted from the second single light source onto at least two second light guide plates. Neither Cho nor Toshiyuki, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a backlight that includes the claimed first single light source and second single light source.

Figures 7 and 8 of Toshiyuki illustrate a backlight device that includes opposing light sources 1a and 1b. However, as can be seen in Figures 7 and 8 of Toshiyuki, the opposing light sources 1a and 1b have the *same length*. Figures 1 and 3 of Cho illustrate four light supply units 150, each having a light guiding plate 110 and a lamp unit 130. However, the lamp units 103 all have the *same length*. Thus, neither Toshiyuki nor Cho disclose or suggest a backlight that includes a first backlight unit having a first single light source, and that includes a second backlight unit having a second single light source *that is longer than the first single light source*.

Accordingly, even the combined teachings of Toshiyuki and Cho fail to disclose or suggest the features of Claim 2. It is submitted that independent Claim 2 is in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 2 be withdrawn.

New Claims 23 and 24 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional features that are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited references. As discussed in detail above, it is

respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is allowable, and therefore Claims 22 and 24 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 2, 19, and 21-24 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073